DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 552 EC 306 361

AUTHOR Dillon, Dennis C.; Patty, Lin Murray
TITLE A Survey of Rhode Island School Superintendents on the Status of Gifted and Talented Education in Their Districts.
SPONS AGENCY Rhode Island State Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, Providence.
PUB DATE 1997-01-00
NOTE 41p.; Paper contains some filled-in type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ability Identification; *Acceleration (Education); *Access to Education; Delivery Systems; Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrichment Activities; *Gifted; *School District Spending; School Districts; *Superintendents; Surveys; *Talent
IDENTIFIERS *Rhode Island

ABSTRACT

In 1996, the Rhode Island State Advisory Committee for Gifted and Talented Education surveyed 34 Rhode Island school superintendents on the status of gifted and talented education in their districts. Findings from the survey indicate: (1) Rhode Island school districts are serving about 4.5 percent of the student population; (2) there were inconsistencies in reporting identification criteria as they relate to service provisions; (3) 33 percent of the school districts reported they had no gifted and talented teachers; (4) some gifted and talented children were more likely to be served than others in 59 percent of the school districts in Rhode Island; (5) in 1996 11 cents of every $100 spent on K-12 education supported the education of gifted and talented children; and (6) 33 of the 34 school districts allow some form of acceleration. Recommendations urge local education agencies to increase identification efforts and provision of appropriate programs to all children, to promote staff development in the area of gifted and talented, to review policies so that instructional and/or institutional barriers to acceleration options are removed, to allocate a fair and equitable portion of limited funds for gifted and talented children, and to initiate research studies to determine the effectiveness of gifted and talented programs. (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 418 552

A Survey Of Rhode Island School Superintendents On The Status Of Gifted And Talented Education In Their Districts

Prepared for:
The Rhode Island Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education and Peter McWalters, Rhode Island Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

Prepared by:
The Rhode Island Advisory Committee on Gifted and Talented Education

Study Team Sub Committee:
Dennis C. Dillon, ED.D, Director of Guidance-New Shoreham School District
Lin Murray Patty, Gifted and Talented Education Teacher-Exeter-West Greenwich School District
Myrna George, Vice-Chairperson Exeter-West Greenwich School Committee
Judy Pardo, Chair-State Advocates For Gifted Education

DILLON

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

January 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 306361

Acknowledgments

The sub-committee study team would like to thank the superintendents and/or their designees for participating in this research survey. Without their support and cooperation we would have been unable to complete this study.

Thank you to Dr. John Wilkinson of the Rhode Island Department of Education for his assistance with this study.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

The Rhode Island State Advisory Committee on Gifted and Talented Education undertook and completed *A Survey Of Rhode Island School Superintendents On The Status Of Gifted And Talented Education In Their Districts*. One hundred percent of the superintendents and/or their designees responded to this survey. Six key recognition and service issues regarding gifted and talented education provided the framework for data analysis, implication statements and recommendations.

Key Issue 1: How many gifted and talented children are served in Rhode Island?

In this study, like other studies, accurately accounting for numbers of gifted and talented children was a difficult task because of the different kinds of programs. Some states identify more than 10% of their student population as gifted, and many remain at a somewhat historical level of 5%. According to the respondents of this survey it seems that Rhode Island school districts are serving about 4.5% of the student population. It would appear that state and local educational agencies need to take a more accurate stance in reporting the number of gifted and talented children, regardless of the nature of the program.

Key Issue 2: Do Rhode Island schools adequately identify and recognize our most able students?

There seems to be inconsistencies in reporting identification criteria as it relates to service provisions. Seventy nine percent of the school districts indicated that they utilize at least three types of identification criteria. The most frequently used type is parent and teacher referrals and recommendations (76%), group tests (74%) and student records and portfolios(68%). However, as reported by the school districts in this survey, none serve populations in the pre-k/kindergarten population. Fifty eight percent serve an elementary population and 55% serve a middle school population. Twenty seven percent of the school districts indicated that they serve a high school population. It appears that local educational agencies need to actively increase their identification efforts as they relate to service provisions so that inconsistencies are eliminated.

Key Issue 3: Do we have the instructional and administrative personnel in our Rhode Island schools who can recognize talent and provide appropriate nurturance?

Forty five percent of the school districts reported having a G&T Coordinator and 52% indicated that they do not fund such a position. Sixty seven percent of the school districts indicated a presence of G&T teachers, but only 55% indicated G&T training for their G&T teachers. Thirty three percent of the school districts in Rhode Island indicated as having no G&T teachers. There is an obvious need for administrative and instructional personnel staff development in the area of gifted and talented education.

Key Issue 4: Do we provide appropriate programs for all gifted and talented children no matter what their age, race or ethnicity may be?

Some gifted and talented children are more likely to be served than others in 59% of the school districts in Rhode Island. Data relative to racial and ethnic diversity was not provided by 41% of the school districts. At all times it is imperative that Rhode Island school districts strive to recognize talent, and provide appropriate services to <u>all</u> children, including populations of racial and ethnic diversity that have been historically disadvantaged.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Issue 5: Does the current level of district and state funding allow for the adequate education of gifted and talented children?

Nineteen districts (56%) indicated that they have a budget line amount for gifted and talented education in their districts and 14 (44%) indicated that they do not have a budget line amount. The nineteen districts reported a total of $1,105,644 allocated for gifted and talented. The total to educate children in Rhode Island is about $1.12 billion. Eleven cents ($.11) of every $100 spent on k-12 education in Rhode Island in 1996 supported the education of gifted and talented children. Local and state efforts to educate gifted and talented children should be in the form of fair and equitable allocation of limited funds.

Key Issue 6: What are the range of acceleration services and educational options currently available to Rhode Island's gifted and talented children?

Acceleration is a strategy that allows students to be placed at the level of a discipline that is appropriate to their talent and knowledge. Thirty three of the 34 school districts indicated that they allow for some form(s) of acceleration. Thirty three percent of the school districts address early k or 1st grade acceleration. Fifty eight percent of the districts allow for grade skipping and 79% allow advanced placement in a subject without the student being assigned a higher grade. Thirty eight percent of the school districts allow con-current enrollment in elementary/middle, middle/high school and high school/college. Four (12%) school districts allow for summer access programs. Seventeen(50%) school districts allow curriculum compacting and 15% allow telescoping as an acceleration strategy. Many school districts allow for various acceleration types to be conducted in their schools, but there are many who do not. The delivery of gifted and talented services should not be hindered by either institutional or instructional barriers.

Recommendations

The results of this survey are intended to be a helpful step forward in the overall effort of defining the goals and outcomes of gifted and talented education in the State of Rhode Island. A primary goal of this Advisory Committee is to provide recommendations to the Commissioner of Education on how to creatively meet the needs of gifted and talented children in his ALL KIDS agenda for education in Rhode Island. ***Toward that end, we suggest in the short term of 1997 that:***

1. ***local education agencies strive to recognize talent by actively increasing their identification efforts, and by providing appropriate programs to <u>all</u> children, including populations of racial and ethnic diversity that have been historically disadvantaged.***

2. ***staff development in the area of gifted and talented must be planned and implemented at the local district level with the cooperation and collaboration of the State education agency and local institutions of higher education.***

3. ***State and local education agency policies be reviewed so the instructional and/or institutional barriers to acceleration options for gifted and talented children be removed.***

Toward that end, we suggest in the long term of 1998 that:

4. ***the State effort to educate gifted and talented children should be in the form of a fair and equitable allocation of limited funds.***

5. ***State and local education agencies conduct research studies that determine the effectiveness of their gifted and talented programs.***

6. ***this survey instrument, and the procedure, be refined and expanded to include State and local needs analysis data that address gifted and talented students, their parents, faculty and community groups.***

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Page

Acknowledgments

Executive Summary i

Table of Contents ii

List of Tables iii

List of Figures iv

Introduction 1

Background Data 1

Delimitations 1

Audience 1

Respondents 2
- Districts responding 2

Results 2
- Key Issues 2
- Key Issue 1: Number of Gifted and Talented Served 3
- Key Issue 2: How Districts Identify Gifted and Talented Children 4
- Key Issue 3: Staffing for Gifted and Talented 5
- Key Issue 4: Racial and Ethnic Diversity 6
- Key Issue 5: Funding for Gifted and Talented 7
- Key Issue 6: Acceleration as a Conceptual Strategy 8

Self-analysis Profile Matrix of Survey Responses that Relate to Talented and Gifted Education among Rhode Island School Districts 9

Preliminary Advisory Committee Recommendations 10

Appendix A: Survey Questionnaire and Fax Transmission

Appendix B: Verification Letter

Appendix C: Brief Descriptions of School District Programs

Appendix D: Data Spreadsheets of School District Responses

Appendix E: Time Management and Technical Plans for Survey

Appendix F: References

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

List of Tables

Table | Page

1. Number of Gifted and Talented Children Served in Rhode Island School Districts 3

2. Gifted and Talented Student Populations Served by School Districts, Type of Identification Criteria Used and Number of Criteria Used 4

3 Status of Gifted and Talented Staffing in Rhode Island School Districts 5

4. Frequency and Percent of School Districts Reporting the Racial and Ethnic Diversity of Their Gifted and Talented Students 6

5. Number of Districts Indicating a Budget Line Amount for Gifted and Talented Education .. 7

6. District Allocation of Budget Line Amounts by Account Type 7

7. Frequency and Percent of Acceleration Strategy Types Utilized by Rhode Island School Districts 8

List of Figures

Figure Page

1. A self-analysis profile matrix of survey responses that relate to gifted and talented education program components among Rhode Island School Districts 9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Survey Of Rhode Island School Superintendents On The Status Of Gifted And Talented Education In Their Districts

I. Introduction

During the Winter and Spring of 1996, the Rhode Island State Advisory Committee for Gifted and Talented Education secured the services of Consultant Lesa Andreasen to assist the Committee in developing mission statements, goals and objectives. One outcome of the series of planning sessions that ensued was the identification of the need to provide recommendations to the Commissioner of Education on how to creatively service the needs of gifted and talented children in his ALL KIDS agenda. Implicit in this proposed presentation was the need to identify the current status of Gifted and Talented Education in Rhode Island.

A listing of survey information was developed in the February planning session. Additional survey information was gathered from the current literature and from various State education departments. A survey questionnaire was finalized in late February (see Appendix A).

Survey questionnaires were faxed to the Superintendent's office in each of the 34 Rhode Island school districts in late February and early March. A follow-up telephone request was initiated in mid-April. Completed questionnaires were analyzed and submitted to this writer on May 8, 1996. A preliminary report was presented to the Advisory Committee on May 14, 1996. A data verification packet was developed (Appendix B) and faxed to the Superintendent's office in each of the school districts in early June. Data was updated and presented to the Advisory Committee for their review on July 29, 1996. A Final Report was presented to the Advisory Committee on October 30, 1996. Recommendations were prioritized at the December 11, 1996 Advisory Committee meeting.

II. Background Data

The population that ranges from ages 5 through 86 of the State of Rhode Island is 957,000. This population is made up of 91.4 percent White, 3.9 percent Black, 4.6 percent Hispanic and .3 Asian and American Indian. This data is compiled from 1993 Census Bureau estimates.

Rhode Island is made up of 39 cities and towns in which there are 34 school districts. There are approximately 148,978 school children that are served in these districts. The total cost to educate children in Rhode Island is approximately $1,012,153,886. Local education agencies (LEA's) contribute $582,398,692. The State's share is $385,900,664 and the Federal Government is $43,854,530 . The percentage share of each governmental agency is LEA-57.5 %; State-38.1%; Federal-4.3% (RIDE, 1996).

III. Delimitations

This survey is not an evaluation of Rhode Island school administrators their designees, students, staff, parents or communities. Student, parent and community representation is not included in this survey. Surveys were faxed to the Superintendent's office and/or their designees in each Rhode Island school district. Statistical tests of significance were not applied to the survey data. Private and parochial schools are not represented in this survey.

IV. Audience of this survey.

The survey is intended for members of the Rhode Island State Advisory Committee For Gifted And Talented Education. Its purpose is threefold: (1) to generate a data base on the current status of gifted and talented education according to Rhode Island Superintendents and/or their designees, (2) to highlight those school districts that are active in the delivery of gifted and talented education and (3) to present to the Commissioner of Education advisory committee recommendations supporting specific services that creatively meet the needs of the gifted and talented students in Rhode Island.

V. Respondents

Districts Responding

Thirty four surveys, which comprise 100 percent of the public school districts in the State of Rhode Island, were completed. Respondents reported that their districts have 127,253 pupils which is 85 percent of RIDE student population figures. Twenty eight districts (82%) indicated that they have a gifted and talented program in place. Respondents from 6 school districts (18%) reported that they do not have a gifted and talented program. One district reported that their gifted and talented program has been in effect for 30 years. One district indicated zero years of operation because they are in the beginning developmental stages.

VI. Results.

The results of this survey are intended to be a helpful step forward in the overall effort of defining the goals and outcomes of gifted and talented education in the State of Rhode Island. The survey attempts to focus on the status of key recognition and service issues regarding gifted and talented education in Rhode Island. Highlighting these issues will provide the framework for Advisory Committee recommendations to the Commissioner on how to creatively service the needs of gifted and talented children in his ALL KIDS agenda for education in Rhode Island

Key Issues

1. ***How many gifted and talented children are served in Rhode Island ?***
2. ***Do Rhode Island schools adequately identify and recognize our most able students?***
3. ***Do we have the instructional and administrative personnel in our Rhode Island schools who can recognize talent and provide appropriate nurturance?***
4. ***Do we provide appropriate programs for all gifted and talented children no matter what their age, race or ethnicity may be?***
5. ***Does the current level of district and state funding allow for the adequate education of gifted and talented children?***
6. ***What are the range of acceleration services and educational options currently available to Rhode Island's gifted and talented children?***

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Issue 1: How many gifted and talented children are served in Rhode Island?

The total number of gifted and talented children served in Rhode Island seems to be a difficult number to determine because of (1) the inconsistencies in reporting the data on the survey, (2) the number of school-wide enrichment models that were reported and the number of schools who made no response to the question. Despite these limitations we know that the k-12 non-School Enrichment Model (SEM) districts responding to this survey indicated that they have 94,931 students. Respondents from these districts reported that they serve 3,910 gifted and talented students or 4.5 percent of their student population as reported in Table 1, Number of students served (k-12, non-SEM).

Six districts utilize a School Enrichment Model (SEM) and also identify gifted and talented students. The total number of students in these districts as reported is 18,769. Respondents from these districts reported that they also serve 1,779 gifted and talented students or 9.5 percent of their SEM student population.

Two districts using SEM models reported serving 8,386 students. The respondents from these districts reported that they do not identify gifted and talented students.

Two districts did not provide student population data.

Table 1.

Number of Gifted and Talented Children Served in Rhode Island School Districts

	Total Number (N-34)	Total Number G & T (N-34)	Percent
Number of students in districts (k-12, non-SEM)	94931	3910	4.5
Number of students in districts (k-12 SEM)	18769	1779	9.5
Number of students in districts (k-12 SEM) and not identifying G & T	8386	-0-	-0-
Number of students not reported	5803		
Total number of students	127,889	5724	4.5

In the Marland Report to Congress (Marland, 1972) on gifted and talented education, it was estimated that by using the criteria of that time, gifted students made up about 3 to 5 percent of the student population . In a more recent study (Ross, 1993) it was noted that states and local districts found it difficult to collect the data on the exact number of students served, but did find that the number of students identified varies from state to state due to differences in state laws and local practices.

Some states identify more than 10 percent of their student population as gifted, and many remain at the 5 percent level. According to the respondents of this survey it seems that Rhode Island school districts are serving about 4.5 % of the student population.

New definitions of multiple intelligence (Gardener, 1983) add levels of criteria that could redefine the identification process, which could result in an increase in the numbers of students served. A number of Rhode Island school districts indicated that they have adopted a form of school enrichment programming for serving gifted and talented children (Figure 1).

Implications

In this study, like other studies, accurately accounting for numbers of gifted and talented children was a difficult task. It would appear that state and local educational agencies need to take a more accurate stance in reporting the number of gifted and talented children, regardless of the nature of the program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Issue 2: Do Rhode Island schools adequately identify and provide services to our most able students?

In examining the data displayed in Table 2, the districts seem to focus on certain areas of the school population more than on other areas. In view of the recent literature regarding the importance of early identification (Ross, 1993; Feldhusen, 1992), Rhode Island schools seem to delay gifted and talented identification and appropriate services until the elementary grades. As reported by the schools in this survey, no schools serve populations in the pre-k/kindergarten population. Only (58%) of the schools serve an elementary population and only (55%) of the schools serve a middle school population. There seems to be an inconsistency in reporting high school gifted and talented programs because only (27%) of the schools indicated that they serve a high school population (Table 2A), and (79%) schools indicated they allow Advanced Placement (Table 7).

Table 2: Gifted and Talented Populations Served by School Districts, Type of Identification Criteria Used and Number of Identification Criteria Used.

A: Gifted and Talented Populations Served by School Districts.

Student Population	Number of School Districts Frequency (N-34)	Percent
Pre-k/kindergarten populations served	-0-	-0-
Elementary populations served	19	58
Middle school populations served	18	55
High School populations served	9	27

B: Type of Identification Criteria Used

Type of Identification Criteria	School District Use Frequency (N=34)	Percent
Parent and Teacher Referrals and Recommendations	26	76
Group Tests	25	74
Student Records and Portfolios	23	68
Individual Tests	16	47
Student Products	16	47
Other (Self Nomination, Task Committee, Peer Nomination.)	12	35
Anecdotal Records	11	32

C: Number of Criteria Used.

Number of Criteria Used	School District Use Frequency (N=34)	Percent
7	2	6
6	5	15
5	5	15
4	10	30
3	5	15
2	2	6
1	1	3
0	4	1

The Regulations of the Rhode Island Board of Regents on Education for Gifted and Talented Children (RIDE, 1989) call for districts to have written evidence of selection criteria, using a minimum of three identification devices, including performance in the regular classroom. An examination of Table 2B shows that many schools do use a variety of identification criteria in selecting their gifted and talented. Table 2C shows that 27 (79%) of the responding schools use the minimum of three identification devices.

Implications

It is essential that state and local school districts employ every possible type of criteria for the identification of gifted and talented children. It appears that local educational agencies need to actively increase their identification efforts with regard to gifted and talented education in their region.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Issue 3: Do we have the administrative and instructional personnel in our Rhode Island school districts who can recognize talent and provide appropriate nurturance?

Table 3

Status of Gifted and Talented Staffing in Rhode Island

	Frequency (N=34)	Percent
Number of districts who employ a G&T Coordinator	15	45
Number of districts who do not employ a G&T Coordinator	17	52
Number of districts indicating presence of G & T teachers.	22	67
Number of districts indicating G&T training for the G&T teachers.	18	55
Number of districts indicating no G& T teachers.	11	33

An examination of Table 3 shows that there is a need for staff development in gifted and talented education in the State of Rhode Island. Fifteen districts (45%) reported that they employ a Gifted and Talented coordinator. Seventeen districts (52 %) reported that they do not fund such a position. Of the 15 districts reporting the employment of a coordinator, four districts employ at a 5/5 equivalent; one at a 4/5 equivalent; one at 2/5 and four at a 1/5 equivalent.

Twenty two (67%) of the Rhode Island school districts indicated a presence of gifted and talented teachers in their schools. The total number of gifted and talented teachers indicated by these Rhode Island school districts is 41.3. One district has 5 gifted and talented teachers and one district has a 2/5 equivalent gifted and talented teacher.

Eighteen schools (55%) indicated formal gifted and talented teacher training for their gifted and talented teachers.

There was no indication of gifted and talented teachers in 11 (33%) of the school districts.

In a recent national report (Prisoners of Time: Report of the National Commission on Time and Learning, 1994), it was noted that a majority of gifted and talented children spend their school day in a traditional classroom setting with teachers who have neither the background, nor the experience, to meet their needs. Such conditions should not be acceptable in the Nation or in Rhode Island.

Implications

It would appear that there is a need for administrative and instructional personnel in the area of gifted and talented education in Rhode Island. Staff development must be planned and implemented at the local district level with the cooperation and collaboration of the State education agency and local institutions of higher learning.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Issue 4: Do we provide appropriate programs for all gifted and talented children independent of their race or ethnicity?

As was previously noted, Rhode Island schools seem to be lacking in Pre-k/kindergarten and high school programs for gifted and talented children (Table 2A). There seems to be a modest effort at the elementary and middle school levels. If Rhode Island schools seem to be lacking in school programs for gifted and talented children in general school populations, what is happening to those populations of racial and ethnic diversity that are historically disadvantaged?

This question needs further study. Table 4 shows that 14 (41%) schools did not provide data on the racial and ethnic diversity of their gifted and talented students. Of the 20 schools who did provide data : 12 schools (35%) indicated that they serve an Asian population; six schools (18%) serve a Black population; 4 schools (12%) serve an Hispanic population; and no schools serve an American Indian population. It appears that in (59%) of the schools in Rhode Island, some gifted and talented children are more likely to be served than others.

Table 4
Frequency and Percent of School Districts Reporting the Racial and Ethnic Diversity of Their Gifted and Talented Students.

Racial and Ethnic Diversity Categories	Number of Districts Frequency (N=34)	Percent
Asian	12	35
White	18	53
Black	6	18
Hispanic	4	12
American Indian	-0-	-0-
No Response	14	41

Implications

At all times it is imperative that Rhode Island school districts strive to recognize talent, and provide appropriate services to all children, including populations of racial and ethnic diversity that have been historically disadvantaged. In the face of tightening educational budget times, it may become even more imperative because funding sources may be available to school districts based on their populations of racial and ethnic diversity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Issue 5: Does the current level of district and state funding allow for the adequate education of gifted and talented children?

Nineteen (56%)districts indicated that they have a budget line amount for gifted and talented education in their districts and 14 (44%) indicated that they do not have a budget line amount (Table 5). The greatest budget amount reported in this survey was $145,000, and the smallest was $370. District budgeting of gifted and talented funds ranged from salaries, supplies and benefits, to conferences, curriculum development and stipends (Table 6). Some districts include salary and benefits for gifted and talented staff in their general budgets, and others do not. One district has utilized Title IV funds.

The inconsistencies to the responses regarding school district budget allocations make it difficult to determine exactly what the current level of district funding entails. We do know that the 19 districts reported budget line amounts for gifted and talented education that total about $1,105, 644. The total to educate children in Rhode Island is about $1.12 billion. We know from the data of this survey that $.11 cents of every $100 spent on k-12 education in Rhode Island in 1996 supported gifted and talented education. This expenditure is five times the amount reported in one national survey which noted that only 2 cents of every $100 spent on k-12 education in the United States in 1990 supported special opportunities for talented students (Ross, 1993).

What we do know is that the current level of State funding for gifted and talented education is $25,000. The State has utilized these funds to conduct workshops, provide funding for gifted and talented professionals to attend national conferences, and to hire consultants to assist in the work of the Advisory Committee.

Table 5.

Number of Districts Indicating a Budget Line Amount for Gifted and Talented Education.

Budget Line Amount	Number of Districts	
	Frequency (N=33)	Percent
yes	19	56
no	14	44

Table 6.

District Allocation of Budget Line Amounts by Account Type

Budget Item	Number of Districts	
	Frequency (N=33)	Percent
Salary	13	39
Supplies	11	28
Benefits	6	18
Field Trips	2	6
Transportation	2	6
Programs	2	6
Conferences	1	3
Curriculum Development	2	6
Stipends	1	3

Implications

The state and local effort to educate gifted and talented children should be in the form of a fair and equitable allocation of limited funds.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Issue 6: What are the range of acceleration services and educational options currently available to Rhode Island's gifted and talented children?

Acceleration is a strategy that allows students to be placed at the level of a discipline that is appropriate to their talent and knowledge. Thirty three of the 34 districts responding to this survey question indicated that they allow for some form(s) of acceleration. Table 7 displays the numbers of acceleration strategy types utilized by Rhode Island school districts.

Table 7.

Frequency and Percent of Acceleration Strategy Types Utilized by Rhode Island School Districts

Acceleration Strategy Type	District Response Frequency (N=34)	Percent
Early K or 1st Grade	11	33
Grade Skipping	20	58
Advanced Placement	27	79
Concurrent Enrollment	13	38
Summer Access Program	4	12
Curriculum Compacting	17	50
Curriculum Telescoping	5	15

Eleven schools (33%) address early k or 1st grade acceleration. Every major study done in the last decade addresses the need for early childhood education that focuses on identification and provision of service options to those young children who display talent. These children and their parents need to be assured of the availability of appropriate services by trained and qualified professionals.

Grade skipping is a form of flexible pacing, and is well documented in the research as a viable option for gifted and talented children (ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, 1989). Twenty (58%) Rhode Island schools responded "yes" to the question of allowing grade skipping, and 14 (41%) do not allow this option.

Twenty seven (79%) schools allow advanced placement in a subject without the student being assigned to a higher grade. In this study, advanced placement has students placed for part of the day at a more advanced grade level for one or more subjects.

Thirteen (38%) schools allow con-current enrollment in elementary/middle, middle/high school, and high school/college, and 20 (62%) schools indicated that they do not allow this option.

Only four (12%) school districts allow for summer access programs. This is an area where local universities, colleges and schools could develop partnerships whereby more summer access programs could be offered for all children, and especially for gifted and talented children. Currently, only Brown University and Rhode Island College offer summer enrichment programs.

Seventeen (50%) districts allow curriculum compacting, and 5 (15%) districts allow curriculum telescoping as an acceleration strategy. These strategies offer a cost effective alternative for addressing the needs of the gifted and talented. Staff development in these techniques should be encouraged.

Implications

The data in Table 7 indicate that many school districts do allow for various acceleration types to be conducted in their schools, but there are many who do not. The delivery of gifted and talented services should not be hindered by either institutional or instructional barriers. Policies of local agencies, and perhaps at the State level, need to be reviewed and removed if they impose an institutional or instructional barrier to acceleration strategies. That effort may result in the single most cost-effective strategy for serving gifted and talented children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VII. Self-analysis profiles of Talented and Gifted Education among Rhode Island School Districts.

Individual profiles regarding gifted and talented education in Rhode Island can been seen from the brief program descriptions displayed in Appendix B, and from an analysis of the responses to the survey questionnaire data spreadsheets found in Appendix C.

A snap shot of what is happening can be found in the analytic matrix in Figure 1. The analytic matrix was developed from the component parts of this survey. These parts of the survey are a compendium of Advisory Committee input, review of the literature, Rhode Island-BEP Regulations and Sub-Committee review.

An examination of this analytic matrix shows that many schools in Rhode Island are very active with respect to gifted and talented education. Other schools are less active, and there are some schools in which gifted and talented education appears to have little or no emphasis.

Figure 1: An analytic matrix of survey responses that relate to gifted and talented education activities

School Districts	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11
Barrington	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
Bristol/Warren	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Burrillville	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Central Falls	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
Chariho	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
Coventry	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Cranston	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
Cumberland	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
East Greenwich	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
East Providence	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Exeter-W.Green	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
Foster Gloster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jamestown	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Johnston	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lincoln	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Little Compton	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
Middletown	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
Narragansett	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Newport	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
New Shoreham	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Kingstown	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
North Providence	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
North Smithfield	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
Pawtucket	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Portsmouth	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Providence	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Scituate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Smithfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
South Kingstown	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Tiverton	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Warwick	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Westerly	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
West Warwick	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
Woonsocket	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0

Activity

1. Districts identified themselves as having a gifted and talented program.
2. Districts identified themselves as having a history in gifted and talented education.
3. Districts provided numbers of g & t children served and/or school wide enrichment.
4. Districts serve two or more school age populations and/or school wide enrichment.
5. Districts identified themselves as using three or more identificatioin criteria.
6. Districts employed a gifted and talented coordinator.
7. Districts employed gifted and talented teachers.
8. Districts reported racial and ethnic populations.
9. Districts indicated that they have a budget line item for gifted and talented education.
10. Districts reported using two or more acceleration strategy types.
11. Districts reported school wide enrichment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VIII. Preliminary Advisory Committee Recommendations

The results of this survey are intended to be a helpful step forward in the overall effort of defining the goals and outcomes of gifted and talented education in the State of Rhode Island. A primary goal of this Advisory Committee is to provide recommendations to the Commissioner of Education on how to creatively meet the needs of gifted and talented children in his ALL KIDS agenda for education in Rhode Island. *Toward that end, we suggest in the short term of 1997 that:*

1. *local education agencies strive to recognize talent by actively increasing their identification efforts, and by providing appropriate programs to all children, including populations of racial and ethnic diversity that have been historically disadvantaged.*

2. *staff development in the area of gifted and talented must be planned and implemented at the local district level with the cooperation and collaboration of the State education agency and local institutions of higher education.*

3. *State and local education agency policies be reviewed so the instructional and/or institutional barriers to acceleration options for gifted and talented children be removed.*

Toward that end, we suggest in the long term of 1998 that:

4. *the State effort to educate gifted and talented children should be in the form of a fair and equitable allocation of limited funds.*

5. *State and local education agencies conduct research studies that determine the effectiveness of their gifted and talented programs.*

6. *this survey instrument, and the procedure, be refined and expanded to include State and local needs analysis data that address gifted and talented students, their parents, faculty and community groups.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS TELEPHONE SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION IN THEIR DISTRICTS

DISTRICT_____ DATE_____
SUPERINTENDENT_____ DESIGNEE_____

1. HOW MANY STUDENTS ARE THERE IN YOUR DISTRICT?_____.

2. DO YOU HAVE A GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM? YES/NO
HOW LONG HAS IT BEEN IN EFFECT?_____.

3. HOW MANY GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS DOES YOUR DISTRICT SERVE AT THIS TIME?_____.

	MALE	FEMALE
4. HOW MANY PK/K?_____.	____	_____
ELEMENTARY_____.	____	_____
MIDDLE_____.	____	_____
HIGH SCHOOL_____.	____	_____

5. HOW DO YOU IDENTIFY GIFTED & TALENTED CHILDREN IN YOUR DISTRICT? LET ME READ THE LIST AND THEN I WILL ASK YOU TO REPLY YES OR NO TO EACH.

_____STUDENT RECORDS AND PORTFOLIOS
_____PARENT AND TEACHER REFERRALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
_____ANECDOTAL EVIDENCE
_____STUDENT PRODUCTS
_____GROUP TESTS
_____INDIVIDUAL TESTS
_____OTHER(EXPLAIN)_____.

6. DO YOU EMPLOY A GIFTED & TALENTED COORDINATOR? YES/NO
IF YES? WHAT IS THE FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) 5/5,4/5,3/5,2/5,1/5
IF YES? HOW MANY GIFTED & TALENTED TEACHERS DO YOU HAVE?____.
HAVE THEY HAD FORMAL GIFTED & TALENTED TRAINING?_____.

7. WHAT IS THE RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY OF THE GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS IN YOUR DISTRICT?
_____PERCENT OF ASIAN STUDENTS.
_____PERCENT OF WHITE, NON-HISPANIC STUDENTS.
_____PERCENT OF BLACK STUDENTS.
_____PERCENT OF HISPANIC STUDENTS.
_____PERCENT OF AMERICAN INDIAN STUDENTS.

8. DO YOU HAVE A BUDGET LINE AMOUNT FOR GIFTED & TALENTED ? YES/NO
WHAT DOES IT INCLUDE?_____.
WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF THE BUDGET LINE ITEM?_____.

9. CAN YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE PROGRAM? eg.PULL-OUT, ENRICHMENT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10. ACCELERATION IS A CONCEPTUAL STRATEGY THAT ALLOWS STUDENTS TO BE PLACED AT THE LEVEL OF A DISCIPLINE THAT IS APPROPRIATE TO THEIR TALENT AND KNOWLEDGE.

DOES YOUR DISTRICT ALLOW ANY OF THE FOLLOWING:

_____EARLY ENTRANCE TO KINDERGARTEN OR THE 1ST GRADE?
_____GRADE SKIPPING?
_____ADVANCED PLACEMENT IN A SUBJECT (without being assigned to a higher grade, the student is placed for part of the day with students at more advanced grade levels for one or more subjects)?
_____CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT IN ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE SCHOOL, MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL, HIGH SCHOOL/COLLEGE?
_____SUMMER SCHOOL ACCELERATION PROGRAMS?
_____CURRICULUM COMPACTING?(no intro, drill, review-move through curr. quickly).
_____CURRICULUM TELESCOPING?(complete a one year course in a semester).

ON BEHALF OF THE COMMISSIONERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY. IT IS THIS COMMITTEE'S INTENTION TO DEVELOP RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION FOR THE STATE. DATA GATHERED FROM THIS SURVEY WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO YOU.

Appendix B

RI Advisory Committee on Gifted and Talented Education
June 7, 1996

Superintendent
Every School District
fax number

Dear Superintendent,

Thank you for your district's response to the RI School Superintendents Survey on the Status of Gifted and Talented Education in Their Districts. Below and attached is the information that we received for your district. We are requesting verification of survey results to finalize this study. Please FAX your verification to: Lin Murray Patty at 397-6770 by June 12th. We thank you for your past and future cooperation. The results of this survey are being presented to Commissioner McWalters and the Board of Regents this summer.

Cordially yours,

Lin Murray Patty

Appendix C

Question 9. Can you briefly describe the program? eg Pull-out, enrichment

Barrington
Barrington has adopted the Schoolwide Enrichment Model. An Early Childhood Enrichment Specialist works with youngsters in grades K-3 in a Consultant Model. She provides whole group enrichment. She also meets with high ability students in small groups. These groups continually change, depending on the subject area and interests of the children. There is no formal identification process at this level. The Enrichment Specialist that works with the fourth and fifth grade students, uses a pull-out model in which students are engaged in Type II (skills) and Type III (independent study) activities. At this level, a formal identification of students is made. Various tests of intellectual and creative ability are given to students who are recommended by teachers, or have scored high on standardized testing, or have shown high academic success. Besides testing, factors such as: teacher recommendation, motivation, and stick-to-it-ness are considered. At the Middle School, students can elect to sign up for enrichment courses. The Enrichment Program is a pull-out program, for a 90 minute block of time, once a week. The courses are open to all students interested in applying.

The three Enrichment Specialists work with small groups of students recommended by classroom teachers for accelerated study. They provide whole group instruction in a classroom setting for enrichment and thinking skills. Working with the classroom teacher, the Specialists work as consultants for curriculum compacting. They work with teachers, pulling-out high ability students in order to provide a differentiated curriculum, as an extension of a given unit of study. They co-teach with classroom teachers; provide resources; and model teach. The Specialists are responsible for promoting and or facilitating state wide and national competitive programs for talented students. Parents, teachers, and the community receive information concerning enrichment and gifted education through workshops, talks, and written communications provided by the Specialists. They provide before and after school enrichment activities such as: the Newspaper, the Drama/Dance Club, the Math Club, the Chess Club, Odyssey of the Mind etc.

Burrillville
(Elem./ 4th & 5th)We are involved in developing the schoolwide enrichment program (interest-based), however, we still have a pull-out program

Bristol/Warren
We have moved away from a pull out model to a whole class enrichment approach. However, we continue to identify students and work with the high end learners in cluster groups.

The total talent development of all students is the ultimate goal of the Colt/Andrews and Hugh Cole School gifted and talented program. To accomplish this, a series of diverse learning opportunities are available. Currently all 4th and 5th grade classes receive whole class enrichment lessons which focus on curriculum topics in the content areas of math, science, language arts, social studies and computer technology. The emphasis is on lessons which foster hands-on learning and stimulate critical and creative thinking skills. The six major themes around which these lessons are built include technology, confidence, and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

calculation.

Students who are identified as needing additional learning opportunities are given personalized instruction via cluster groups, independent study programs designed in collaboration with regular classroom teachers, mentorships to nurture a student's interest/academic strength area and curriculum compacting as deemed appropriate to each situation.

A large enrichment library of educational resource materials which supplement the regular curriculum is available for staff and parents to utilize upon request.

A teacher/coordinator is responsible for program development and management, curriculum development, direct instruction to all program participants, student evaluation, program evaluation and linkages with parents, teachers, administrators and the community. The program seeks grants to foster community service learning, to link together students of various learning styles in pursuit of common goals and to integrate various content within the curriculum. The teacher coordinates special programs such as Invent America, essay contests, spelling bees and other academically oriented events. The g/t teacher works closely with all 4th and 5th grade teachers to ensure that each student is being challenged to reach her/his potential.

At the middle school level, the g/t coordinator serves as a consultant to provide teachers and administrators with supplemental enrichment materials which are grade level appropriate and curriculum related. The g/t coordinator also serves as the coordinator of the CTY/Johns Hopkins program. A parent/student workshop is held each fall to describe this voluntary academic program to any interested qualified students. Students qualify for this on the basis of their 6th grade Spring MAT scores.

Central Falls
Full day 5 day per week program for students grade 5 & 6. Services top 5-10% of that population. Integrated curriculum which includes compacting, acceleration.

Coventry
Pull-out enrichment
some consultation with teachers/parents

Cranston
We have a lower elementary program that impacts on all students at one time or another through in class enrichment. A total of 159 classrooms have been impacted as of March this year. There are 159 lower elementary students who are seen for increased enrichment. Our upper elementary program (grades 4-5) is a more intense resources center program serving approximately 70 students. Middle school students are handled through in class and pull out enrichment. This is a new program and I do not have stats.

Cumberland
Pull out program 2 hours weekly

East Greenwich
Pull out program, each grade coming on a separate day. Larger classes are split in half.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

East Providence
Enrichment Triad Model researched by the University of CT
250 Type I's, 75 Type II's, 45 Type III's

Exeter West Greenwich
The EWG Talented and Gifted (TAG) program emphasizes critical thinking and technology. The elementary TAG teacher serves as a consultant to students and teachers grades K-2. Appropriate modifications are made by the classroom teacher. All third grade students receive whole class enrichment during the year from the TAG teacher. These activities provide a basis for further identification testing for the pull-out program. Students in grades 4-6 meet in small groups several times a week for a total of 1.5 to 4 hours. Current events, the Stock Market Game, computer/video applications and thinking skills are integral to the program. All fifth and sixth grade students pursue an independent area of study which culminates in a presentation which is videotaped. Students in seventh and eighth grade meet with the TAG teacher once a week for two hours. The TAG teacher works with the other faculty to produce projects that have curriculum correlations. The students use a BBS and learn about the television studio. In grades nine through twelve there are honors and AP courses. Early kindergarten or first grade placement and grade skipping is done on an individual basis, but this is not frequently done.

Jamestown
We do not have the typical "gifted" program. It is not a formal "pull-out" program. We have never accepted state dollars for this. We believe that there are many forms of giftedness and believe in the Renzulli method and task orientation. All individuals have unique gifts and talents. Gifted and talented children are identified by music, art, speaking, and writing. Every student in school has the opportunity to be on stage every year. There is a musical production at every grade level. Jamestown employs a full time instrumental teacher, full time vocal, one and one half time art, a writing program, individual math enrichment, a speaking program and on and on. Any student may take any of our programs. We offer scholarships in conjunction with the Connonicut Art Association for students in the summer. We also work with the Newport Art Museum. We have in the past offered photography. We have a dance program at each school open to anyone with task orientation (they must stick with it)) in grades three to eight. There is an after school electronics club - students get HAM Radio Licenses. There is an environmental group, they use our natural marshland. There are chess clubs grades 7 & 8, magic club grade 5-8. We open our school to the Jamestown Theatre Group - many students are involved in drama.

Johnston
Program Gifted discontinued in 1992 - Participants gr. 4 & gr. 5 elementary pull-out program with gifted teacher - there is screening in place not used since program discontinued.

Little Compton
Our schoolwide enrichment meets every Friday for 45 minutes. The students rotate per term. FPS students meet during lunch every day. I am not officially a coordinator. I do organize, implement, and evaluate a G/T program for identified students (6-8) and school wide enrichment for all students grades 1-5. I use my own time to accomplish these tasks.

Lincoln
In class enrichment -all grade 4/5
Pull-out GT. students 4-6 twice per week
Honors program 7-12

Middletown
Basically a pull-out program in which students meet with teacher 1 hour 10 min. twice in a 6 day cycle. Teacher also teaches high level 5th grade math once in 6 days and a 6th grade reading class once in 6 days

Narragansett
Enrichment

Newport
Both pull-out and enrichment

North Kingstown
Enrichment talent development model. Need to do more district staff development to coordinate efforts. Focus on "talent"pools and curriculum differentiation.

North Smithfield
Part time after school program

Pawtucket
Elementary Enrichment = Pull-out grades 4, 5, 6 in math and humanities (10 elementary schools)
Project PASS = Advanced Standing/Honors Classes in four major subjects grades 7-12 (5 secondary schools)

Providence
The Providence Approach to Gifted Education (P.A.G.E.) gives opportunity to selected students to participate in an enriched program and to work with their academic peers in a regular school environment. At the elementary and middle schools, resource teachers provide an enrichment program; at the high school, advanced level courses and after-school enrichment activities are available. The program specifically focuses on students' academic abilities and interests. There is a rolling admissions policy in the elementary and middle level programs, but this depends on availability of seats in the various schools. Students enter the program as a result of a comprehensive screening process.

Portsmouth
Our elementary program is a pullout (resource) program serving grades 2-4 (2 hours per week) Students are involved in enrichment activities which develop skills in problem solving, researching, and critical thinking.
(Grade 1 students may be seen by the resource teacher at the request of their teacher if they demonstrate potentially high academic achievement ex. fluent reading before entering school)

South Kingstown
- In class with instructional modification
- Limited cluster grouping
- Advanced placement

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Tiverton
The program is an accelerated and enrichment program servicing students in grades 5-8 in language arts and math. Each student meets for one period each day for each subject in the program

Warwick
pull-out

Westerly
Westerly's Gifted and Talented Program began as a pull-out program which serviced approximately the top 10% of the school population. The program consisted of interdisciplinary themes focusing on higher order thinking skills and product development which culminated in an interactive schoolwide "open house."

For the last several years we have moved this program to a more inclusive model, providing classroom teachers with training in curriculum modification in working with high ability students, training in enrichment opportunities and practices for the general school population and the identification of appropriate challenging enrichment material for classroom use. For the last 2 years we have focused on Dr. Renzulli's Schoolwide Enrichment Model which talent development, curriculum modification, and enrichment learning and teaching.

West Warwick
enrichment

Woonsocket
GT. Art enrichment program grades 8-12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D

		Barrington	Brist/War	Burrillville	Central Falls	Charlho	Coventry	Cranston	Cumberland	E. Greenwich	E. Prov.	Ex/ W. G.	Foster/Glocester	Jamestown	Johnston	Lincoln
											Dale Francis Sc.				drop 1972	
1)	Students in District	2800	4200	3000	3040	3926	5449	10400	4879	2228	600	1998			3313	3333
	Non-SEM schools	2800	4200				5449	10400	4879	2228	600					
2)	G/T Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2		2	1
	Years in effect	12	16	15	10	20	18	30	12	15	6	15				10+
3)	Total identified G/T	946					172	159	107	52	370					380
	Non-SEM G/T students	946					172	159	107	52	370					380
	SEM also ID pop.		857	546	24							232				
	SEM no ID pop.			no ID (SEM)	(SEM)	Mult. Intel.										0
4)	PK/K	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
	Male			0												
	Female			0								199	0			15% (4-6)
	Elementary	853	36	800	0	(SEM)	122	159	107	52		28				50
	Male		14				83		36	34		22				50
	Female		21				39		71	18		33				20%
	Middle	293		46	24	(SEM)	80									50
	Male	84			11		24									50
	Female	209			13		26									180
	High School			A/P		Honors, AP	0									90
	Male															90
	Female															
5)	Student Records		1	1	1	1		1	1		1	1			1	1
	Parent/Teacher	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1			1	1
	Anecdotal	1		1	1	1		1			1				1	
	Student Products	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1				1	1
	Group Testing	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1
	Individual tests	1				1	1			1						
	Other	Self-nomination			IEP for LD	Interest sur.					Rose Creativity					
6)	G/T Coordinator		1			1	1		1	1	1					
	FTE	2		2	2			2				2	2		2	2
	G/T Teachers (FTE)		1/5			1/5			<1/6	5/6	5/5	0				
	Formal Training	3	0.8	0.8	1	2	2	3.8	2		1	1.2				2
7)	percent Asian	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1				1
	percent white	3					0.008			1	1	1				
	percent black		98	99	88		99.002		100	98.2	2	2				98
	percent Hispanic		2		4						98	98				
	percent Am. Indian				8						2					
												1				1
8)	budget	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2		2		2	
	includes	3, 8	3, 4	partial 3, 8	3, 4	3, 4, 5, 8	3		3, 8	3, 4, 6, 7		2, 3, 8				$145,000
	amount	$102,311	$57,412	$13,000	$56,084	$99,991	$98,718	1	$96,871	$58,810		$63,643				1
10)	Early K or 1st					1	1	1	1							1
	Grade Skipping	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1				1
	Advanced Placement	1		1		1		1	1	1						
	Concurrent enrollment										1					
	Summer Acc. Prog.					1	1	1	1							1
	Curriculum Compacting	1	1		1	1		1			Francie School data only!					
	Curriculum Telescoping	1														

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1=yes, 2=no, 3=salaries, 4=benefits, 5=supplies, 6=field trips, 7=trans, 8=curr dev, 9=prgs, 10=conf, 11=stipends

RI School Superintendents' Survey on Status of G/T Education in their Districts

		L. Compton	Middletown	Narragansett	Newport	New Shoreh	No Kingstown	No.Providence	No. Smithfield	Pawtucket	Portsmouth	Providence	Scituate	Smithfield	So. Kingstown
1)	Students in District	382	2721	1825	3100	126	4480	3563	1700	9425	2756	24089		2706	4000
	Non-SEM schools	382		1825		126		3563	1700	9425	2756	24089		2706	4000
2)	G/T Program	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
	Years in effect	12	14	0.5	10	0	1	8	14	18 E/14 Sec	18	18			10
3)	Total identified G/T	21	58	110		0		127	38	400	118	666			10
	Non-SEM G/T students	21	58	110				127	38	400	118	666			
	SEM also ID pop.				246		no ID (SEM)							0	0
	SEM no ID pop.				(SEM)		0	0	0	0	0	0			
4)	PK/K	0	0	0	0						0			0	10
	Male		0												6
	Female		0					90	38	80	92	176			4
	Elementary	0	27	0	206				20		46	74			
	Male		16		97				18		46	102			
	Female		11		109			37		140	28	168			
	Middle	17	31	110	20						18	72			
	Male	9	19								10	96			
	Female	8	12							180	honors/AP	352			
	High School	4			20							154			
	Male	3										148			1
	Female	1					1	1	1	1	1	1			1
5)	Student Records	1			1		1	1	1	1	1	1			
	Parent/Teacher	1	1		1					1					1
	Anecdotal				1	1						1			
	Student Products	1			1		1			1	1	1			1
	Group Testing	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
	Individual tests		1				talent portfolio	MAT7	Adm. input					2	2
	Other		Writing Se	"Developing			1	1	2						
6)	G/T Coordinator	2	2	2	2	2				4/5	1/5	2/5			0
	FTE				2	0			0.2	2	1.8	4			
	G/T Teachers	1	1		1	0		3	1	1	1	1			
	Formal Training	1	1			0			2.8	2	1	7			100
7)	percent Asian		7						97.4	79	99	55			
	percent white	100	93							9		23			
	percent black									8		15			
	percent Hispanic											0			
	percent Am. Indian									1	1	1			
8)	budget		1	1	1	2	1	1	2				2	2	2
		2					3, 8		Title VI funds	8, 9, 10, 11	8	3, 5, 6 *			
	includes		2, 3	9	3, 4, 5, 7		$43,000		$7,300	$30,000	$370	$79,000		1	
	amount		$48,397	$17,000	$111,842							1		1	1
10)	Early K or 1st				1				1		1	1	1	1	1
	Grade Skipping		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	Advanced Placement	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1				
	Concurrent enrollment						1				1	1			
	Summer Acc. Prog.			1					1						
	Curriculum Compacting	1			1										
	Curriculum Telescoping														

* 84 Secdry curr. compac' office budget
thru reported now training for gifted prg

1=yes, 2=no, 3=salaries, 4=benefits, 5=supplies, 6=field trips, 7=trans, 8=curr dev, 9=prgs, 10=conf, 11=stipends

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		Tiverton	Warwick	Westerly	W.Warwick	Woonsocket	Totals
					prg start 96-97		
1)	Students in District	2103	1300	3431	4000	6800	127263
	Non-SEM schools	2103	1300		4000	6800	94831
2)	G/T Program	1	1	1	1	1	27
							6
	Years in effect	13	10	14	0	15	
3)	Total identified G/T	98	340			85	6034
	Non-SEM G/T students	98	340			85	4256
	SEM also ID pop.			75			1779
	SEM no ID pop.			10% (SEM)			
4)	PK/K	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Male						0
	Female						0
	Elementary	0	190	75	0		2911
	Male						484
	Female						531
	Middle	98	150			16	821
	Male	40				9	334
	Female	58				7	487
	High School					69	99
	Male					28	28
	Female					41	41
5)	Student Records	1		1		1	22
	Parent/Teacher	1	1	1		1	28
	Anecdotal			1			61
	Student Products			1			11
	Group Testing	1	1	1			16
	Individual tests	1		1			28
	Other	task comm, peer nom.				Arts proficiency	
6)	G/T Coordinator	1	1	1	1		14
						2	
	FTE	5/5		5/5			
	G/T Teachers	2	5	1			
	Formal Training	1		1			18
7)	percent Asian		2			12	
	percent white	100				82	
	percent black					4	
	percent Hispanic					2	
	percent Am. Indian						
8)	budget		1	1	1		19
		2				2	14
	includes	3	5, 6	5, 9	3, 5		
	amount			$9,500			$1,105,844
10)	Early K or 1st	1		1	1		11
	Grade Skipping	1		1			19
	Advanced Placement	1		1	1	1	28
	Concurrent enrollment		1	1			12
	Summer Acc. Prog.	1					4
	Curriculum Compacting	1		1			16
	Curriculum Telescoping						3
					* 96-97 start		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1=yes, 2=no, 3=salaries, 4=benefits, 5=supplies, 6=field trips, 7=trans, 8=curr dev, 9=prgs, 10=conf, 11=stipends

Appendix E

Time Management Plan for Survey

Survey Activities		JA FE MA AP MA JU JY AU SE OC NO DE JA FE
1.	Advisory Committee Meetings	———————————————
2.	Survey Questionnaire	
2.1	Development	——
2.2	Copy/Fax Sheet	——
2.3	Fax to Superintendents	—
3.	Follow-Up Telephone Calls	——
4.	Preliminary Report	
4.1	Data Spreadsheet	—
4.2	Analyse Data	—
4.3	Report Writing	—
4.4	Report Review	—
4.5	Presentation to Adv. Com. @ NK	—
5.	Verification of Survey Results	
5.1	Verification Packet (draft letter)	——
5.2	Copy Verification Letter	——
5.3	Collate Packets	——
5.4	Fax Verification Packets to Superintendents	——
5.5	Receive Verification from Superintendents	—
5.6	Follow-Up Telephone Calls	—
6.	Finalize Report	
6.1	Update Data Spreadsheet	—
6.2	Analyse and Update Data	—
6.3	Report Writing	—
6.4	Report Review	—
6.5	Final Draft to Advisory Committee	—
6.6	Prioritize Recommendations	—
7.	Present to Commissioner	—
8.	Present to Board of Regents	—
9.	Present to Superintendents	—
10.	Present to Various Advisory Committees	—

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Technical Plan for Survey

Survey Activities			Denny	Lin	Myrna	Judy	John
1.	Advisory Committee Meetings		X	X	X	X	X
2.	Survey Questionnaire						
	2.1	Development	X				
	2.2	Copy/Fax Sheet		X	X		X
	2.3	Fax to Superintendents		X	X		X
3.	Follow-Up Telephone Calls		X	X	X	X	
4.	Preliminary Report						
	4.1	Data Spreadsheet		X			
	4.2	Analyse Data	X	X			
	4.3	Report Writing	X				
	4.4	Report Review	X	X	X	X	
	4.5	Presentation to Adv. Com. @ NK	X	X	X	X	
5.	Verification of Survey Results						
	5.1	Verification Packet (draft letter)	X	X			
	5.2	Copy Verification Letter	X	X			
	5.3	Collate Packets		X			
	5.4	Fax Verification Packets to Superintendents		X			
	5.5	Receive Verification from Superintendents		X			
	5.6	Follow-Up Telephone Calls		X			
6.	Finalize Report						
	6.1	Update Data Spreadsheet		X			
	6.2	Analyse and Update Data	X	X			
	6.3	Report Writing	X				
	6.4	Report Review	X	X	X	X	
	6.5	Final Draft to Advisory Com.	X	X			
7.	Present to Commissioner		X	X	X	X	
8.	Present to Board of Regents		X	X	X	X	
9.	Present to Superintendents		X	X	X	X	
10.	Present to Various Advisory Committees		X	X	X	X	

Appendix F

References

ED 314916. (1989). *Meeting the Needs of Able Learners Through Flexible Pacing. ERIC Digest #464.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children: Reston, VA

Feldhusen, J. F. (1992). *Early Admission and Grade Advancement for Young Learners.* The Gifted Child Today, 15 (2), 45-49.

Gardener, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligence.* New York: Basic Books.

Marland, S. P. (1972). *Education of the Gifted and Talented. Report to Congress.* Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Prisoners of Time: Report of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning. (1994). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Rhode Island Department of Education. (1996). *Office of Finance Report to Regents.* Providence, RI: Author.

Rhode Island Department of Education. (1989). *Basic Education Program: Gifted and Talented Education.* Providence, RI: Author.

Ross, Pat O'Connell. (1993). *National Excellence: A Case for Developing America's Talent.* Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE